

trafficking. This consideration applies equally to information acquired from, or collated or analyzed for, both law enforcement agencies and agencies of the U.S. foreign intelligence community.

(5) From subsection (e)(2) because application of this provision could present a serious impediment to law enforcement in that it would put the subject of an investigation, study or analysis on notice of the fact of such investigation, study, or analysis, thereby permitting the subject to engage in conduct intended to frustrate the activity; because, in some circumstances, the subject of an investigation may not be required to provide to investigators certain information; and because thorough analysis and investigation may require seeking information from a number of different sources.

(6) From subsection (e)(3) (to the extent applicable) because the requirement that individuals supplying information be provided a form stating the requirements of subsection (e)(3) would constitute a serious impediment to law enforcement in that it could compromise the existence of a confidential investigation and reveal the identity of confidential informants and endanger their lives and safety.

(7) From subsection (e)(4)(I), to the extent that this subsection is interpreted to require more detail regarding the record sources in this system than have been published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Should the subsection be so interpreted, exemption from this provision is necessary to protect the confidentiality of the sources of criminal and other law enforcement information and to protect the privacy and physical safety of witnesses and informants. Furthermore, greater specificity concerning the sources of properly classified records could compromise national defense or foreign policy.

(8) From subsection (e)(5) because the acquisition, collation, and analysis of information for law enforcement purposes does not permit advance determination whether such information is accurate or relevant, nor can such information be limited to that which is complete or apparently timely. Information of this type often requires further analysis and investigation to de-

velop into a comprehensive whole that which is otherwise incomplete or even fragmentary. Moreover, its accuracy is continually subject to analysis and review, and, upon careful examination, seemingly irrelevant or untimely information may acquire added significance as additional information brings new details to light. The restrictions imposed by subsection (e)(5) would restrict the ability of trained investigators and intelligence analysts to exercise their judgment in collating and analyzing information and would impede the development of criminal intelligence necessary for effective law enforcement.

(9) From subsection (e)(8) because the individual notice requirements of subsection (e)(8) could present a serious impediment to law enforcement by revealing investigative techniques, procedures, or evidence.

(10) From subsection (g) to the extent that the system is exempt from subsection (d).

[Order No. 78-93, 58 FR 41038, Aug. 2, 1993]

**§ 16.83 Exemption of the Executive Office for Immigration Review System—limited access.**

(a) The following system of records is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(d):

(1) The Executive Office for Immigration Review's Records and Management Information System (JUSTICE/EOIR-001).

This exemption applies only to the extent that information in the system is subject to exemption pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k) (1) and (2).

(b) Exemption from the particular subsections are justified for the following reasons:

(1) From subsection (d) because access to information which has been properly classified pursuant to an Executive Order could have an adverse effect on the national security. In addition, from subsection (d) because unauthorized access to certain investigatory material could compromise ongoing or potential investigations; reveal the identity of confidential informants; or constitute unwarranted invasions of the personal privacy of third parties.

(2) From subsection (d) (2), (3), and (4) because the record of proceeding constitutes an official record which includes transcripts of quasi-judicial administrative proceedings, investigatory materials, evidentiary materials such as exhibits, decisional memoranda, and other case-related papers. Administrative due process could not be achieved by the ex parte "correction" of such materials by the individual who is the subject thereof.

[Order No. 18-86, 51 FR 32305, Sept. 11, 1986]

**§ 16.84 Exemption of Immigration Appeals System.**

(a) The following system of records is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(d) (2), (3) and (4):

(1) Decisions of the Board of Immigration Appeals (JUSTICE/BIA-001).

This exemption applies only to the extent that information in this system is subject to exemption pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k).

(b) Exemptions from the particular subsections are justified for the following reasons:

(1) From subsections (d) (2), (3) and (4) because the decisions reflected constitute official records of opinions rendered in quasi-judicial proceedings. Administrative due process could not be achieved by the ex parte "correction" of such opinions by the subject of the opinion.

**§ 16.85 Exemption of U.S. Parole Commission—limited access.**

(a) The following systems of records are exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a (c) (3) and (4), (d), (e) (2) and (3), (e)(4) (G) and (H), (e)(8), (f) and (g):

(1) Docket Scheduling and Control System (JUSTICE/PRC-001).

(2) Inmate and Supervision Files System (JUSTICE/PRC-003).

(3) Labor and Pension Case, Legal File, and General Correspondence System (JUSTICE/PRC-004).

(4) Statistical, Educational and Developmental System (JUSTICE/PRC-006).

(5) Workload Record, Decision Result, and Annual Report System (JUSTICE/PRC-007).

These exemptions apply only to the extent that information in these systems is subject to exemptions pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2).

(b) Exemptions from the particular subsections are justified for the following reasons:

(1) From subsection (c)(3) because revealing disclosure of accountings to inmates and persons on supervision could compromise legitimate law enforcement activities and U.S. Parole Commission responsibilities.

(2) From subsection (c)(4) because the exemption from subsection (d) will make notification of disputes inapplicable.

(3) From subsection (d) because this is essential to protect internal processes by which Commission personnel are able to formulate decisions and policies with regard to federal prisoners and persons under supervision, to prevent disclosures of information to federal inmates or persons on supervision that would jeopardize legitimate correctional interests of security, custody, supervision, or rehabilitation, to permit receipt of relevant information from other federal agencies, state and local law enforcement agencies, and federal and state probation and judicial offices, to allow private citizens to express freely their opinions for or against parole, to allow relevant criminal history type information of co-defendants to be kept in files, to allow medical, psychiatric and sociological material to be available to professional staff, and to allow a candid process of fact selection, opinion formulation, evaluation and recommendation to be continued by professional staff. The legal files contain case development material and, in addition to other reasons, should be exempt under the attorney-client privilege. Each labor or pension applicant has had served upon him the material in his file which he did not prepare and may see his own file at any time.

(4) From subsection (e)(2) because primary collection of information directly from federal inmates or persons on supervision about criminal sentence, criminal records, institutional performance, readiness for release from custody, or need to be returned to custody is highly impractical and inappropriate.

(5) From subsection (e)(3) because application of this provision to the operations and collection of information by